

## REMARKS

### I. Amendments

#### a) In the Specification

The previously requested correction of a typographical error on page 29 has been withdrawn.

b) The claims have been amended without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications, to address the Examiner's rejections as traversed below.

c) Claims 12-15 and 34-44 have been cancelled as directed to non-elected subject matter, without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications.

### II. Rejections under §112 Paragraph 1

Claims 1-11, 16-26, 29-33 and 45-50 stand rejected.

Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, 28, 30-32, and 48-50 have been canceled without prejudice to filing future continuing applications, and so the rejection is moot.

Claim 1 (and thus dependent claims 3-7, 9, 10, 18-26, 29, 33 and 45-47), claim 5, claim 9 (and thus dependent claims 11 and 16), have been amended to better claim the particular subject matter of the claimed invention, without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications. Applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome by these amendments.

### III. Rejections under §112 Paragraph 2

Claims 1-11, 16-26, 28-33 and 45-50 stand rejected for failing to particularly point out the claimed invention.

Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, 28, 30-32, and 48-50 have been canceled without prejudice to filing future continuing applications, and so the rejection is moot.

Claim 1 (and thus dependent claims 3-7, 9, 10, 18-26, 29, 33 and 45-47), claim 5, claim 9 (and thus dependent claims 11 and 16), have been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter of the claimed invention, without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications.

The use of the terms “optionally substituted”, “hydrocarbon group”, “heterocyclic group” and “acyl group” are defined within the specification as filed. One of ordinary skill in the art, from reading the specification, can readily discern the metes and bounds of the claimed invention from the description contained therein. Applicants believe that the rejection is incorrect and should be withdrawn.

The rejection stated in the office action directed towards the use of “prodrug” in claims 2 and 27 should have been directed towards claims 2 and 28. Claims 2 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice and thus the rejection is moot.

The rejection stated in the office action directed towards the ring structure of R in claim 3, should have stated Claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended to overcome this rejection, without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications.

Claim 45 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to remove the extraneous “a”.

Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection of Claim 46, since the applicants do not claim any disease functionality. The applicants claim a method for inhibiting a specific phenomenon that occurs in a mammal by the administration of the compound of the claimed invention. There is no requirement that the applicants claim the treatment of a disease condition. It is entirely reasonable and believable that the administration of the claimed compound will inhibit an activated coagulation factor X in mammals. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that the Examiner’s rejection has been overcome by these amendments and traverse.

#### IV. Claims rejected under 35 USC §101

Claims 48-50 have been canceled without prejudice to filing future continuing applications, rendering this rejection moot.

#### V. Rejections under §112 Paragraph 2

Claims 1-11, 16-26, 28-33 and 45-50 stand rejected for failing to describe the invention so as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention.

Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, 28, 30-32, and 48-50 have been canceled without prejudice to filing future continuing applications, and so the rejection is moot.

Claim 1 (and thus dependent claims 3-7, 9, 10, 18-26, 29, 33 and 45-47), claim 5, claim 9 (and thus dependent claims 11 and 16), have been amended to more particularly point out the

subject matter of the claimed invention, without prejudice to the filing of future continuing applications.

Applicants believe that the specification fully enables the scope of the claims as originally filed, and for the claims as now amended. This rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Claim 27 is allowable


Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claim 27. However, applicants believe that the objection to Claim 27 is incorrect, as Claim 27 is already in independent form. This rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

Reconsideration of the claims as amended in view of the traverse made above is solicited. Early allowance of the claims is requested. Should the Examiner believe that a conference with applicants' attorney would advance prosecution of this application, she is respectfully invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 10, 2003



(847)383-3372  
(847)383-3391

Mark Chao, Ph.D., Reg. No. 37,293  
Elaine M. Ramesh, Ph.D., Reg. No. 43032  
Attorney for Applicants  
Customer No. 23115

Takeda Pharmaceuticals North America, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
Suite 500, 475 Half Day Road  
Lincolnshire, IL 60069 USA